

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

MEETING NAME: WISCONSIN ENTERPRISE ARCHITECTURE TEAM (WEAT)

DATE: MAY 4, 2004

TIME: 10:00 A.M. TO 11:30 A.M.

LOCATION: 5A

WEAT Members:

- Group Leader/Chief Enterprise Architect—Ben Banks (DET)
- Lead Technical Enterprise Architect—George Ross (DET)
- Enterprise Architect—Keith Hazelton (UW)
- Enterprise Architect—Bud Borja (Milwaukee Co., local government)
- Enterprise Architect—Jay Jaeger (DOT, large state agencies)
- Enterprise Architect—Judy Heil (DATCP, small state agencies)

DET Support Staff:

Chris Alberts, Patricia Carlson, Dan Proud

Note: Absent was Chris Alberts. Ben Borja was connected by telephone speaker.

Agenda Items:

1. Additions or Corrections to 4/20/04 Minutes—Dan Proud
2. Review of 4/20/04 Action Items—Ben Banks
3. Comments from Matt M. on EA Strategy Draft—Ben Banks
4. Proposal to Change WEAT Meeting Frequency & Length—Ben
5. Proposal for Joint WEAT and Governance Staff Meeting with META Group—Ben Banks
6. Updates to EA Business Plan Timeline and Phase 2 Deliverables—Ben Banks
7. Assignments and Wrap-up—Ben Banks

Action Items

1. Patricia and Chrystal: Set up next meeting and send out meeting, dates, time and location to WEAT members.
2. Ben/Patricia: Send META Group EA Desk Reference to Bud.

3. Bud: Send IT balanced scorecard information to WEAT members
4. Ben/Patricia: Create task list, timeline for phases 2A, 2B and 2C.
5. Ben/Patricia: Work with DET management to determine ability to use half-day of META Group Consulting Services for Score Card development. If this is approved, then work with Michelle, DET support staff and META Group to identify dates, location and agenda for the half-day session.
6. Bud: Poll county folks on scorecard needs and their participation/ interest in half-day META Group Session.
7. Keith: Contact Common System Interoperability Group regarding their participation in half-day META Group Session.
8. Ben: Get preliminary inventory from Crowe Chizek.
9. Ben/Patricia: Work with domains on getting comments back on scorecards
10. Ben/Patricia: Ask META Group in advance how people handle exceptions, conflicts
11. Ben: Talk to Matt about soliciting input from agency IT projects to find enterprise-wide commonalities (data needed for scorecards)
12. Patricia: Work with John Pribek to send out preliminary announcement about open review period.
13. Patricia: Gather research regarding IT scorecards, develop excel spreadsheet for WEAT member comments to research and then provide this information to WEAT for the next meeting.

Meeting Notes

1. Review of 4/20/04 Minutes—Dan Proud

Minutes were okay--no comments from members.

2. Review of 4/20/04 Action Items—Ben Banks

No action items were left over from the last meeting.

3. Feedback from Matt on the EA Strategy Draft—Ben Banks

Matt likes the EA Strategy. He is still reviewing it, and will return comments by end of week or beginning of next week.

We will need an update of the document to have for the BLC meeting on May 13. Copies will be distributed to Senior Leadership on May 15.

In answer to questions about sharing the draft, Ben said it would be okay, as long as we explain that this is a draft subject to change. This is not the beginning of the open review period.

4. Proposal to Change WEAT Meeting Frequency and Length—Ben Banks

Ben proposed meeting every two weeks for four hours (8:30 to 12:30). No objections were made. Patricia and Chrystal will set up these meetings.

5. Proposal for Joint WEAT-Governance Staff Workshop Led by META Group—Ben

Ben made sure everyone got a copy of the META Group EA Desk Reference. (Patricia will mail a copy to Bud.) Matt does like this reference.

Patricia explained that by contract DOA has a half-day training session with META Group. The proposal is to solicit their comments, have them walk through the process for developing scorecards and advise us as to what documentation is needed to support it. It would be valuable to have the domain managers and co-chairs as well as WEAT members in attendance. We need to come in prepared with questions and input.

Keith mentioned the UW Common System Interoperability Group as people that should be included. Bud said we should poll county folks for input.

Jay said we should schedule the META Group meeting for the first week in June and notify people who should attend now so they are available. TLC members should be notified. We might have the meeting in the afternoon after the June TLC meeting.

This proposal was amenable to all.

6. Updates to EA Business Plan Timelines and Phase 2 Deliverables—Ben Banks

There was a general agreement that Phase 2A would take 90 days by itself. Phases 2B and 2C could be compressed; these will largely be tasks that fall to DOA.

We need to update the project timeline.

Scorecards

Ben said we need to focus on how scorecards should be done and how we should work with the domains. How should we evaluate technology?— several scorecards will be needed.

Jay said we will need to weight factors, and this will require management input. Weighting factors will be useful when items come into conflict.

Ben stressed that the scorecards will always reflect the principles; a "failsafe" or fallback approach will be to go back to the principles. We have to score against the principles, while keeping the reference models in mind.

Resources for developing scorecards: Arizona (though not perfect) and other samples (xref. Team members' recent e-mails); domains; BLC; internal processes; technicians.

Work on the reference models has been moved from Phase 2 to Phase 3.

Bud mentioned that Corporate Executive Board offers a free trial service on developing IT balanced scorecards. He will send information on this to WEAT.

Next Steps—Phase 2A

Jay suggested that the first step we take next is to research who have developed scorecards, what has worked, and what hasn't worked. Patricia added that one experience that has been highly touted is the Return on Investment model from the state of Ohio. Patricia will draw up a spreadsheet listing resources as we read them; team members should enter remarks on the spreadsheet as we read them.

We agreed two weeks is sufficient for researching and commenting on EA materials. Factors to consider when evaluating other plans: motivations, success factors, contact information, granularity of information, weighting factors, scorecard processes, roles in EA processes.

We outlined the following steps for Phase 2A work:

1. META session
2. Develop templates; identify categories for scorecards
3. Build "scaffolding" for reference models while we build the real ones

Jay suggested we send domains an explanation of what we have in mind for reference models and ask them to identify important technologies and their evaluations of them that apply to the models. We should have a review period after which domains can also comment on scorecards. We should also make use of Crowe Chizek overview reports that are being prepared for late June/early July release. Ben agreed that a preliminary inventory from the firm might be helpful for us.

Judy suggested we assign WEAT members to talk to the domains to develop materials. At some point, we should have an executive conference where they all can meet WEAT.

Ben said that at the end of Phase 2 we will review our work; we want to avoid continually reviewing and reworking materials as we go.

Ben explained that domains will develop the templates; we will provide direction and guidance and evaluate and edit them afterwards. We must prioritize the scorecards, addressing areas that need attention first. Judy added that domains can establish subgroups to develop scorecards; this will enable parallel work efforts.

Goals for Phase 2A are to develop:

1. Technology solution process
2. Balanced scorecards
3. Exception process
4. Process to address conflicts
5. Communication strategy for the above

Steps—Phase 2B

Objectives from Phase 2B:

1. It is important to explain a process for developing standards and guidelines, which are different from the scorecards. Another meeting will be necessary to inform the domains about this.
2. A technology refresh process needs a holistic approach:
 - Where do we need guidance?
 - Who goes through the process, and how often?
 - Perform the process in alternate budget years
3. Project reporting methodology

We will get comments from Matt on the Phase as documented in the Business Plan.

Jay voiced a need to obtain data from agency IT projects that should be reflected on the scorecards. We should find enterprise-wide commonalities for project elements. Judy added that as we work through the scorecards, this will be addressed.

Steps—Phase 2C

Enterprise IT justification process will be created.

(See the Business Plan for other deliverables.)

7. Assignments and Wrap-Up—Ben Banks

Preparation for next meeting:

- Continue with research
- Update the WEAT Web site
- Create spreadsheet for research comments
- Develop skeleton for project timeline
- Identify potential dates for the META Group meeting
- Send out a preliminary announcement to TLC, BLC, etc. explaining the upcoming open review period
- For the project plan, include one item from each domain: evaluate former decisions, walk through with the domains

Partial agenda for next meeting: how to relate scorecards to the domains; areas to score; templates we will need; develop questions as group for the META Group meeting; Michelle and domain managers should join us for discussion

Next meeting is Tuesday, May 18, 8:30 to 12:30.